

second contact terminal. Second, the Office Action admits that Sawyer does not teach a foldable keyboard including a first keyboard unit, a second keyboard unit and a rotatable connecting part provided between the first and second keyboard units. Applicants respectfully agree that Sawyer fails to disclose at least these features.

To cure the first noted defect of Sawyer, the Office Action attempts to rely upon Olodort. On page 3, the Office Action alleges that it would have been obvious to incorporate "the connector terminal" of Olodort into the flexible display apparatus of Sawyer in order to adequately transmit signals from the keyboard to any external device and to have the components act, function and look like one device. To cure the second noted defect of Sawyer, the Office Action further alleges that it would have been obvious to incorporate the second keyboard unit of Olodort into the flexible display apparatus of Sawyer in order to provide a compact display that is easily portable.

Applicant respectfully disagrees with both of the above assertions because no motivation exists to combine the applied references. Neither Sawyer nor Olodort teach or suggest the need for the other. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that the modification suggested in the Office Action is based on impermissible hindsight gained from Applicants' disclosure.

First, there is no motivation to modify the connector of Sawyer with the connector of Olodort because Sawyer does not disclose or suggest the need for establishing a connection between its flexible display panel and its keyboard.

Sawyer is directed towards a flexible panel display and to an extendible support apparatus for supporting the flexible panel display in a viewing position. Sawyer discloses two embodiments of its flexible panel display. The first embodiment of the flexible panel display is shown as a monitor in Figs. 1-3, 11, 12, 17 and 18. The second embodiment of the flexible panel display is shown as a portable computer in Figs. 7-10 and 13-16.

Olodort discloses a foldable keyboard assembly which includes a plurality of folding keyboard sections. As shown in Figs. 1 and 16 of Olodort, the keyboard assembly 50 mounts an information device 60 such as a PDA. Fig. 16 depicts the keyboard assembly 50 with a connector assembly 500 extending from one of the frames of the keyboard assembly 50. The connector assembly 500 provides a docking or mounting location for the information device 60 (Olodort, col. 12, lines 20 - 31). The connector includes a connector 510 which connects mechanically and electrically to the information device 60 positioned on a base 540. The connector 510 provides electrical connection between the keyboard and the information device (Sawyer, col. 12, lines 31 - 37).

In the first embodiment of Sawyer, as a monitor, connectors may be provided in the flexible panel display assembly 100 (Sawyer, col. 3, lines 57-61). The connectors of the flexible panel display couple the flexible display assembly 100 directly to the computer system 110, as specifically shown in Fig. 1 of Sawyer. In Fig. 1, there is no direct connection either physically or electronically between the flexible panel display and the keyboard. Thus, in the first embodiment, there is no need to modify the connector of the flexible display panel of Sawyer to communicate with the keyboard of Olodort.

In the second embodiment of Sawyer, as portable computer, the flexible panel display may be rolled and stored in the housing 202, which is integrated in the portable computer assembly 200. The housing 202 includes the keyboard 210 and all other processing components. Thus, housing 202, not only stores the flexible panel display, but also "includes the keyboard 210" (Sawyer, col. 5, lines 50-51). The second embodiment does not even disclose the use of connectors provided within the flexible panel display because the flexible panel display is an integral part of the housing where all of the processing components are provided. Therefore, in the second embodiment, there is no need to provide a connector in the flexible display panel which connects the keyboard of Olodort.

Thus, Sawyer does not disclose or suggest a connector formed in a flexible display which is electrically connected with the first and second keyboard units, because there is no need in Sawyer for such a connector.

Second, even if Sawyer and Olodort are combined, (which would not have been obvious for the reasons set forth above), the combination still does not render the invention obvious. For example, independent claims 1 and 6 call for, among other features, the first contact terminal being connected with the second contact terminal of the connector when the flexible display is drawn upward from the housing main body through the hole for use of the flexible display.

As discussed in the application, for example, on page 26, lines 2-16, in the flexible display 102 of the invention, the position of each terminal electrode 105A is determined so that each terminal electrode 105A faces in contact with each corresponding terminal electrode 104A of the contact terminal 104 of the connector 103 when the flexible display 102 is fully drawn out (unwound) from the roller 111. During nonuse of the input device 100, the flexible display 102 is wound on the roller 111 and therefore there is no need to connect the contact terminal 104 of the connector 103 and the contact terminal 105 of the flexible display 102 with each other. Contact terminals 104, 105 connect with each other only during use of the input device 100 in which the flexible display 102 is fully drawn out (unwound).

Even if Sawyer and Olodort are combined, there is no teaching or suggestion within the applied references to connect the terminals "when" the flexible display is being drawn upward from the housing main body.

Sawyer and Olodort also fail to disclose the features of independent claims 12 and 16. Claims 12 and 16 call for, among other features, wherein the housing main body is constructed to be attachable and detachable with respect to the first or second keyboard unit, and the keyboard and the flexible display in the housing main body are constructed so as to

communicate with each other by wireless communication. Even if Sawyer and Olodort were combined, the housing main body would not be attachable and detachable with respect to the first or second keyboard unit. According to the combination suggested by the Office Action, only the flexible display panel of Sawyer would be connected to the connector assembly of Olodort. No direct connection would be established between the housing of Sawyer with the keyboard of Olodort so that these components would be attachable to and detachable from each other.

Thus, in conclusion, the Office Action has relied on impermissible hindsight knowledge gained from Applicants' disclosure to modify or combine Sawyer with Olodort. Furthermore, even if combined, the applied references fail to disclose, teach or suggest the features of independent claims 1, 6, 12 and 16. Thus, the rejection is improper.

Further, for the reasons discussed, Sawyer and Olodort, taken in combination or alone, do not suggest claim 1 and dependent claims 2, 4, 5, which include additional features, or claim 12 and dependent claims 13, 15 and 16, which include additional features. In addition, Sawyer and Olodort also fails to disclose or suggest claims 8-10 which depend from claim 7, which is discussed below.

In paragraph 3, on page 6 of the Office Action, claims 3, 7, 11 and 14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Sawyer in view of Olodort in further view of U.S. Patent No. 4,341,980 to Noguchi et al. (Noguchi). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

As discussed above, no motivation exists to combine Sawyer with Olodort. In addition, Noguchi fails to provide such motivation. Thus, Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Even if combined, the combination fails to disclose or suggested the combination of the features of claims 1 and 12 as set forth above. Claim 3 depends from claim 1, and sets forth additional features. Claim 14 depends from claim 12, and sets forth additional features.

Noguchi does not compensate for the deficiencies of the combination of Sawyer and Olodort outlined above with respect to claims 1 and 12. Thus, the asserted combination of Sawyer and Olodort does not render claims 3 and 14 obvious for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to claims 1 and 12, and as well as for the additional features claim 3 and 14 recite, respectively. Further, as the combination does not suggest the subject matter of claims 1 and 3 alleged in the Office Action as providing the basis for rejecting claim 7, nor the subject matter of claims 3 and 6 alleged as the basis for rejecting claim 11, it is respectfully requested the rejection be withdrawn.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of claims 1-16 are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff

Registration No. 27,075

Dinnatia J. Doster-Greene

Registration No. 45,268

JAO:DJG/dxc

Attachment:

Petition for Extension of Time

Date: September 1, 2006

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 19928
Alexandria, Virginia 22320
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

**DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE
AUTHORIZATION**

Please grant any extension
necessary for entry;

Charge any fee due to our
Deposit Account No. 15-0461